

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/657,154

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron L Enatsky

Art Unit

3713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron L Enatsky.

(3) Salvatore P. Tamburo.

(2) Michael O'Neill.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,6-8,10-16,18-20,22,23,27-29,33,37-40 and 44-49.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5,741,182 to Lipps et al., US 6,227,968 to Suzuki et al., US 5,229,756 to Kosugi et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussions centered around amendment of claims to include a plurality of operation devices while detecting respective spatial positions of the operation devices. Applicant has also amended claims 44-49 to clarify the operation device is manipulated by a user, with the movement of the device detected for spatial positioning. Examiner has informed Applicant that current amendment would over come the rejection of record. However, prior art of record, such as Kosugi et al. should be considered as Kosugi et al. does teach a plurality of handheld motion detection devices, similar to Applicant's proposed amendment.